

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 are pending in the present application. Claims 1 – 3, 6, 7, 13 – 18, 21, 23 and 25 – 28 stand rejected and Claims 4, 5, 8-12 19, 20 and 24 have been allowed. Claims 1, 7, 14 and 25 – 28 have been amended herein and Claims 6,13, 15 – 18 and 22 have been cancelled herein. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the present amendments and following remarks. The above amendments and following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the outstanding Office Action and to render all claims at issue patentably distinct over the references cited.

The Examiner has objected to Claim 1 due to an informality. This objection is respectfully traversed. Notwithstanding, the noted item has been revised as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the instant objection be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 14 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious in light of Just et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,443,517) and Wolf et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,881,458). This rejection is respectfully traversed. It is believed that the originally filed claims are patentably distinct over the cited references. Notwithstanding, Claim 1 has been amended to essentially include the objected to dependent Claim 22 (with only grammatical revisions). Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the instant rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Just et al. in view of Wolf et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,881,458). Claims 13 and 23 have been rejected as allegedly being obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) in light of Just et al., Wolf et al. and Neubrand (U.S. Patent No. 6,217,104). Claims 15, 16, 18 and

25 -stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Just et al. in view of Wolf et al. and Okada et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,454,344). Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Just et al. in view of Wolf et al., Okada et al. and Neubrand. Claim 21 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Just et al., Wolf et al., Okada et al., and the 2001 Ford Mustang convertible publication. Claim 26 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Just et al. and Wolf et al (this rejection is unclear). Finally, the Examiner has rejected Claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Just et al., Wolf et al., and the Ford Mustang convertible publication. These rejections are all respectfully traversed. It is believed that the originally filed claims are patentably distinct over the cited references. The Examiner appears to be improperly using hindsight reasoning in combining the wide assortment of unrelated references, given the benefit of the present invention. There is no suggestion or motivation in the references to make these combinations. Notwithstanding, these rejections are deemed moot in light of the amendment to the base independent claim or cancellations. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the instant rejections be withdrawn.

In view of the instant amendments, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is requested that the Examiner pass the case to issue at his earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 17, 2006

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MLF/srh

By: 

Monte L. Falcoff, Reg. No. 37,617